

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,822	11/06/2001		Robert R. Moore	ATMI-417-CIP-DIV	2166
25559	7590	11/14/2005		EXAM	INER
ATMI, INC 7 COMMER		F	JOHNSON, EDWARD M		
DANBURY, CT 06810				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1754	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/991,822	MOORE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jonas N. Strickland	1754
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re i. iriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT latute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	3 July 2005.	
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 22-36 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) 25-35 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 22-24 and 36 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers	·	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the col 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to b the drawing(s) be held in abeyand rrection is required if the drawing(s	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document	nents have been received. Itents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) -

Application/Control Number: 09/991,822

Art Unit: 1754

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Detailed Action is in response to the amendment filed on 7/13/05. Claims 22-36 are currently pending. Claims 25, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 36 have been amended to correct minor informalities and no new matter has been added to the claims. Claims 25-35 are allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 22-24 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter (US Patent 5,873,388) in view of Nguyen et al. (US Patent 5,919,425) and Itoh et al. (US Patent 4,719,088).

Applicant claims a method for scrubbing chemical pollutants in a gas stream comprising the steps of continuously introducing said gas stream into a scrubbing chamber, said scrubbing chamber containing coated packing in at least two vertically separated beds, said coating being adapted to entrap or react with said pollutants; monitoring the amount of said pollutants being removed from said stream; and

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/991,822

Art Unit: 1754

regenerating the coating on one of said beds while continuously flowing said gas stream through the other of said beds.

Carpenter discloses a process for treating process gases, such as VOCs, which has a multiple vessel of VOC-abatement catalytic oxidation system, having two vessels arranged so that one is on-stream, while one is off-stream, for continuous treatment of the VOC-containing effluent gas stream (col. 2, lines 1-59). Carpenter continues to disclose monitoring the amount of pollutants being removed from the gas stream (col. 10, lines 30-58). Carpenter continues to disclose wherein the monitoring of the gas stream is vital to the cyclic regeneration of the vertical beds used to clean the gas streams. However, Carpenter does not disclose a scrubbing chamber and a coated packing.

Nguyen et al. teaches a catalyzed packing material for regenerative catalytic oxidation for treating volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide or combinations thereof (see abstract). Nguyen et al. continues to teach wherein the substrate of the packing material is coated and wherein the packing material substrate may be in any configuration, shape, or size, which exposes it to the gas to be treated (col. 6, lines 27-67).

Itoh et al. teaches a process for treating pollutants in gas streams using a scrubber chamber having various kinds of packing material (col. 1, lines 21-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Carpenter, based on the teachings of Nguyen et al. and Itoh et al., by using a scrubbing chamber having packing material, which is regenerated, since Itoh et al. teaches a process for treating pollutants in gas streams using a scrubbing chamber with various packing materials, and Nguyen et al. teaches using coated packing materials which are regenerated in order to treat pollutants in gaseous streams. Such modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, because one of ordinary skill in the art, would have expected a process for treating gaseous streams comprised of pollutants as taught by Nguyen et al. and Itoh et al. to be similarly useful and applicable to a process for treating pollutants in gaseous streams as taught by Carpenter. Carpenter continues to disclose wherein the process for treating the pollutants in a gas stream is also useful in regenerative oxidation systems (col. 13, lines 47-50) as also taught by Nguyen et al.

With respect to claims 23 and 24, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to monitor the amount of pollutants leaving the scrubber, as well as regenerating, based on predetermined time intervals, since Carpenter discloses monitoring the amount of pollutants being removed from the gas stream (col. 10, lines 30-58). Carpenter continues to disclose wherein the monitoring of the gas stream is vital to the cyclic regeneration of the vertical beds used to clean the gas streams.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not 5. persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited prior art fails to disclose a scrubbing chamber containing coated packing in at least two vertically separated beds.

It should be noted that Carpenter has been applied in order to disclose at least two vertically separated beds (see Figure 2, 202 and 204). Nguyen et al. teaches a catalyzed coated packing material, which is regenerated in order to treat volatile organic compounds (see abstract). Itoh et al. has been applied in order to disclose a scrubber chamber having various kinds of packing materials for treating gaseous pollutants. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the cited references, since all of the cited prior art is directed towards treating gaseous pollutants.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 25-35 are allowed.
- 7. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The instant claims 25-35 are allowable over the cited prior art, because claims 25-35 recite wherein the thermal reactor comprises a central chamber comprising heating elements, an entry end and an exit end of the chamber, a side inlet communicating with an exterior air space defined by an exterior wall of the reactor and said heating elements, an interior air space communicating with said exterior air space, said interior space defined by an interior wall of the reactor and said heating elements, and an orifice in said interior wall far introducing air from said interior space into said central chamber.

The cited prior art directed to Carpenter (US Patent 5,873,388), Nguyen et al. (US Patent 5,919,425) and Itoh et al. (US Patent 4,719,088), fail to disclose these limitations.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

Application/Control Number: 09/991,822 Page 6

Art Unit: 1754

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonas N. Strickland whose telephone number is 571-272-1359. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH, 7:30-5:00, off 1st Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/991,822

Art Unit: 1754

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonas N. Strickland September 8, 2005

> STANLEY S. SILVERMAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700